

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application.

New claim 16 has been added to provide additional claim coverage.

Claims 1-3, 7 and 8-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of newly cited Yamada (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,697). Applicant traverses these rejections because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. In addition, there is no suggestion or motivation that would have led one of skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Ishida system to include the voltage control circuit of Yamada. Specifically, Ishida et al. fails to disclose or suggest at the least the following limitations:

Claim 1:

an operating condition setting circuit for controlling an optimally amplified frequency band by setting an operating condition of the input stage amplifier;

Claim 8:

a setting circuit, coupled to the common amplifier, for setting an operating condition of the common amplifier based on a frequency band of the input signal.

The Examiner now appears to concede that Ishida fails to disclose or suggest the above limitations by alleging that Yamada has a “bias voltage setting circuit coupled to a first input stage amplifier.” Office Action page 3. However, voltage controller 40a, in figures 8 and 9, does not have anything to do with controlling an optimally amplified frequency band. The purpose of the voltage controller is to set a target transmission power P_o so that overshooting does not occur at the beginning of an active period. Col. 8, lines 6-27. As such, there would be

no reason for one of skill in the art to add a voltage controller circuit like 40a in Yamada to the Ishida system because there would be no need to set the Ishida intermediate transmission frequency amplifier to a target transmission power.

Also, since Ishida intermediate transmission frequency amplifier 20 operates at only one frequency band (259.1 to 260 MHz), there would be no need to have an operating condition setting circuit for controlling an optimally amplified frequency band. Likewise with respect to claim 8, there would be no need for a setting circuit to set an operating condition of the common amplifier based on a frequency band of the input signal.

In addition, with respect to claim 8, as mentioned above, the Ishida intermediate transmission frequency amplifier 20, which the Examiner alleges is the claimed input stage amplifier, amplifies only one frequency band (259.1 to 260 MHz). However, claim 8 requires that the input amplifier amplify an input signal of a plurality of frequency bands.

Also, even if one were to assume that high frequency band-pass filters 23a and 23b are the claimed high and low pass filters, respectively, those filters are not connected to an output of intermediate transmission frequency amplifier 20. Rather, they are connected to intermediate transmission frequency band-pass filter 21.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 7 and 9-12, they should be allowable at least based on their dependence from claims 1 and/or 8 for the reasons described above. In addition, contrary to the Examiner's assertions regarding claims 2 and 11, there is no disclosure in col. 24, lines 1-35, of the setting of bias voltages for transistors in intermediate transmission frequency amplifier 20. The Examiner asserts that figure 27 includes transistors and setting a bias voltage of transistors with the use of a VCO. However, claim 2 requires that bias voltages of the transistors in the

input stage amplifier. Figure 27 is the VCO; therefore, at best, Ishida discloses setting the bias voltages of transistors of the VCO, and not of transistors in an input stage amplifier.

Claims 4-6 and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida et al. in view Yamada and in view of Dent et al. Applicant traverses these rejections because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. These claims should be allowable at least based on their dependence from claims 1 and/or 8 for the reasons described above and because Dent et al. fails to make up for the deficiencies of Ishida et al. and Yamada.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl J. Pellegrini
Registration No. 40,766

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 9, 2006